## **REMARKS**

Claims 1-11 and 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being obvious over U.S. Patent Publication No. US 2001/0026901 Al to Maeda et al. (hereinafter referred to as "Maeda") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,187,504 B1 to Suwa et al. (hereinafter referred to as "Suwa"). In addition, Claim 12 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Maeda in view of Suwa as applied to Claims 1-11 and 14 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,045,970 A to Choi (hereinafter referred to as "Choi"). Furthermore, Claim 13 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Maeda in view of Suwa as applied to Claims 1-11 and 14 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,093,517 A to Ito (hereinafter referred to as "Ito"). Each of these rejections is respectfully traversed.

Each of the aforementioned rejections relies upon the combination of <u>Maeda</u> and <u>Suwa</u>.

According to the Official Action, <u>Maeda</u> discloses a polymer having the following structure:

$$\begin{array}{c|c}
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\
 & & \\$$

¶¶ 68-69 of <u>Maeda</u>. As acknowledged in the Official Action, however, <u>Maeda</u> fails to disclose a photoacid generator of the formula (3) as set forth in Claim 1. In order to remedy this acknowledged deficiency of <u>Maeda</u>, the Official Action relies upon <u>Suwa</u> which, according to the Official Action, discloses photoacid generators of the claimed type.

It is respectfully submitted that claimed invention is patentable over the cited references. In particular, attached hereto is a Declaration under 35 U.S.C. §1.132 which establishes that compositions as defined by Claim 1 possess unexpectedly superior properties compared to compositions not meeting the claim limitations. As set forth in the attached declaration, a photoresist composition meeting the limitations of Claim 1 (Example 13) exhibited a radiation transmittance at 193 nm of 71 % and achieved resolutions of 0.15 μm whereas a similar photoresist composition (Comparative Example 2) comprising a different acid generator not embraced by formula (3) but otherwise identical to the composition of Example 13 achieved resolutions of only 0.18 μm and exhibited radiation transmittance at 193 nm of only 60 %. Both resists exhibited good pattern configuration and acceptable dry etching resistance.

The compositions of Example 13 and of Comparative Example 2 each comprise resin (A-1). As set forth in the Official Action, this resin is "structurally analogous" to the resin of Example 10 of Maeda (pg. 7, numbered paragraph 10 of the Official Action). Further, the composition of Example 13 comprises the acid generator (B-1) which meets the definition of formula (3) of Claim 1. In contrast, the composition of Comparative Example 2 comprises the acid generator (b-1) which does not meed this definition. The other components of the resist compositions are the same. The Official Action has suggested making a comparison of a resin composition wherein only the acid generator is varied (pg. 7, paragraph 11 of the Official Action). It is respectfully submitted that the data presented in the attached declaration provides such a comparison. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the objective evidence of nonobviousness presented in the attached declaration establishes the patentability of Claim 1 over the cited references. Claims 2-14 depend either directly or indirectly from Claim 1 and are therefore also patentable for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to Claim 1. In view of the above, reconsideration and withdrawal of the aforementioned rejections is respectfully

requested.

## **CONCLUSION**

Applicants submit that this application is now in condition for allowance. However, if any issues remain which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephonic interview, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Applicants' counsel at the phone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

PIPER RUDNICKALLP

Steven B. Kelber Registration No. 30,073

Attorney of Record

Christopher W. Raimund Registration No. 47,258

1200 Nineteenth Street, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20036-2412 Telephone No. (202) 861-3900 Facsimile No. (202) 223-2085